REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

RE: Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 8, 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner indicated that a limitation of "arranging the groups of alarms in the direction of the path" is vague and unclear, and that the limitation is abstract and its meaning cannot be ascertained.

As such, claim 1 has been clarified to indicate that the subset of alarms selected is that subset applying to a service, and that the arrangement of that subset of alarms includes ordering them in the sequence in which they arise as one traverses the path of the service to which the alarms apply.

The Examiner indicated that claims 1,8,9 recite the limitation "the direction", which lacks antecedent basis. Claims 1,8,9 have been amended accordingly.

The Examiner indicated Claim 1 recites the limitation "said network entity", wich lacks antecedent basis. Claim 1 has been amended accordingly.

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Vittal (US Patent No 6,810,496).

In reference to claim 1, the Examiner suggests Vittal teaches a method for describing a problem in a network, comprising:

selecting a subset of alarms associated with a service, said service having a

unique identifier and being carried by a path in the network, said network including a number of network entities, the subset of alarms being selected from a list of alarms in the network (column 12 lines 54-62 and column 13 lines 1-10);

grouping the selected subset of alarms in a number of groups, each group being associated with said network entity (column 12 line 63 - column 13 line 15);

arranging the groups of alarms in the direction of the path of the service in the network (column 12 line 63 - column 13 line 15);

and

transforming each alarm in each group of the selected subset of alarms into a problem description for the service (column 6 lines 19-26).

Respectfully, the Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejections for the following reasons. Vittal discusses selecting different parts of a network, and suggests that alarms may be raised against network entities or by applications, but the selection of a subset of alarms across the network based on an individual service is absent from Vittal. Vittal further does not group and order any subset of alarms according to the sequence those alarms are encountered in a traversal of a path utilized by the service across the network. Finally, Vittal does not produce a problem description for a service from a transformation of any such subset of alarms. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify these distinctions.

Thus, Vittal does not include each and every element of the amended claim 1, and therefore the present invention is not anticipated by Vittal.

As claims 2-13 depend on the amended claim 1, and introduce further features, claims 2-13 have been also differentiated over Vittal.

Conclusion

Claims 1, 8, and 9 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner and Claim 1 has been clarified to provide further differentiation over Vittal. Claims 2-13 depend on Claim 1, and are therefore also differentiated over Vittal.

No new matter has been added.

Favorable consideration and allowance of the pending claims of the application are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Victoria Donnelly
Registration No. 44,185